

**REMARKS**

In the Official Action of November 20, 2006 (which the Examiner made Final), the only objections raised by the Examiner were under 35 U.S.C. 112 (first and second paragraphs).

Thus, Claim 27, line 6, was objected to under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as lacking an antecedent for "said closed end". This was a typographical error, and has been corrected by changing "closed" to -- open -- end.

With respect to the objection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the Examiner referred to the recitation, in Claim 27, of an acoustical coupling member "within the enclosure", and indicated that this appears to read only on the embodiment of Fig. 7. Claim 27, of course, was intended to be generic to all the disclosed embodiments, and therefore the words "within said enclosure", which should have been canceled, have been canceled, such that the acoustical coupling member is set forth as being "located with respect to said pressure-pulse source" ---.

Since the application otherwise appears to be allowable, it is believed that the foregoing amendments to correct the matters objected to in the Final Action now place the application in condition for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan  
Registration No. 40,338

December 11, 2006